UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/509,167	09/13/2005	Heino Rehse	195.55	5032

22497   7590   11/24/2008
LARSON AND LARSON
11199 69TH STREET NORTH
LARGO, FL 33773

EXAMINER
PARK, EDWARD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2624	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/24/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

ADVISORY ACTION ATTACHMENT TO PAPER NO. 20081117

Specification

1.   In response to applicant's amendment of the title, the previous title objection is withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed on 10/28/08, in regards to claim 4, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the disclosures of the references do not teach a fictive view can be calculated from a single image for a point at which the camera, which has captured the image, has not been positioned (see pg. 3, last paragraph). This argument is not considered persuasive since it is disclosed within Shirato in paragraphs [0047]-0050], spherical mapping reproduces the original three-dimensional space inside the sphere 7 in the virtual space, the user can look in any desired direction or scale up or down the image by simply manipulating the virtual camera placed at the center of the sphere 7; where any number of virtual cameras can be added, one original image can be viewed from various angles at the same time to output multiple perspective views. Examiner notes that the specific limitation only calls for the ability to view the image at a different virtual camera position, which is met by the Shirato reference.

     Applicant argues that Shirato does not teach a fictive camera position (see pg. 4, second paragraph). This argument is not considered persuasive since it is clearly shown in Shirato within paragraphs [0047]-[0050], that a virtual camera is utilized to view an original image from

various angles. Applicant states that Shirato shows multiple cameras at the same position, such as the center of the sphere pointing in different directions at different angles (see pg. 4, second paragraph). This statement by the applicant partially validates that the limitation of a fictive camera position is taught by Shirato, but the applicant did not cite that the camera positions are virtual. Therefore, the applicant has admitted partially that the limitation is indeed taught by Shirato within the applicant's own argument section.

Applicant argues that it would not have been obvious to combine Peleg and Shirato together and considering them as a whole (see pg. 5, second paragraph). This argument is not considered persuasive since the combination of Peleg and Shirato is valid under 35 USC 103 (a) and the rejection still stands as cited in the previous Final Office Action dated on 8/28/08. In response to applicant's argument that combination of Peleg and Shirato is not valid, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Applicant argues that claim 5 is allowable due to the dependency from claim 4 (see pg. 5, third paragraph). This argument is not considered persuasive since the rejection of claim 4

stands as cited in the Final Office Action dated 8/28/08 and the arguments can be seen above. Furthermore, applicant argues that the calculation of a corresponding image point in 3D space P on the pipe surface which is not contemplated by the two cited art references (see pg. 5, third paragraph). This argument is not considered persuasive since the Peleg reference discloses the limitation within figure 11, pg. 24, last paragraph - pg. 26, first paragraph; each image point $P = (x, y, fc)$ in image plane 1103.

Applicant argues that claim 6 is allowable due to the dependency from claim 4 (see pg. 5, last paragraph, pg. 6, first paragraph). This argument is not considered persuasive since the rejection of claim 4 stands as cited in the Final Office Action dated 8/28/08 and the arguments can be seen above. Furthermore, applicant argues that the references do not disclose calculating from the desired fictive camera position, and its viewing angle in space, a single image point located in a desired section of an image used to calculate corresponding image point coordinates on an inner surface of the pipe (see pg. 5, last paragraph, pg. 6, first paragraph). This argument is not considered persuasive since the Peleg reference discloses the cited limitation within figure 11, pg. 24, last paragraph - pg. 26, first paragraph; each image point $P - (x, y, fc)$ in image plane 1103, three-dimensional position of a point Q on the pipe 1101, corresponding pixel in image plane 1103 for the point Q is $P = (x, y, fc) = (fc\ Qz\ /\ ......)$.